

### REMARKS

By this amendment, applicant cancels claims 2 and 7, and adds claim 13. Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-13 are pending in the application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-6, 9-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,819,304 to Branson.

The present invention, as amended, includes transceiver with a latch and spring, connected to the transceiver and to the plurality of display devices, for controlling ejection of the plurality of display devices about the transceiver, with the ejected plurality of display devices having a rectangular shape. An enlargement of the video signal is displayed on the plurality of display devices. The transceiver has a wireless connection.

Branson does not teach or suggest using with a transceiver, such as a cell phone, palm pilot or computer having a wireless connection, and a latch and spring for controlling ejection of the display devices about the transceiver. Accordingly, the rejected claims are not anticipated by Branson.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-3, 7-8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,859,219 to Sall. The Examiner states that Branson does not disclose the expanding spring load and latch, and looks to Sall for the spring loaded latch.

As Applicant points out, Branson does not teach or suggest using a latch and spring for initially expanding the plurality

of display devices. Sall does not have the expanding display devices which form a rectangular shape. Indeed, Sall teaches away from Applicant's invention, by expanding to a non rectangular shape, and thus it would not be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sall with Branson.

Applicant brings to the attention of the Examiner, a SEARCH REPORT and WRITTEN OPINION for the co-pending PCT patent application. Copies are attached. In particular, in WRITTEN OPINION, Box No. V, Section 2 Citations and explanations, the Examiner states "Claims 1-12 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest an improvement to a transceiver....." See previously submitted PCT report, attached with Amendment A.

Applicant solicits allowance of the claims.

Applicant is a **SMALL ENTITY**.

**SMALL ENTITY** fees were previously submitted with Amendment A, and thus, no further fees should be due with this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID NEWMAN CHARTERED

By: 

Date: March 26, 2006

David B. Newman, Jr.  
Registration No. 30,966